DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 554 HE 006 932

TITLE Comparative Effectiveness of Alternative Administrative Structures. Annex -- Case Study Questionnaires. Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education.

INSTITUTION Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris (France). Centre for Educational Research and Innovation.

REPORT NO IMHE-GC-74.37

PUB DATE 18 Dec 74

NOTE 107p.; Paper presented at the General Conference of Member Institutions (2nd, Paris, January 20-22, 1975). For related documents, see HE 006 933 and 934

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$5.70 Plus Postage

DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy; *Case Studies; Comparative Analysis; Conference Reports; Data Analysis; Departments; Glossaries; *Higher Education; *Management Systems; Organizational Effectiveness; Policy Formation; *Questionnaires; Statistical Data; *University Administration

ABSTRACT

A set of detailed questionnaires was developed to test a number of hypotheses related to the definition and measurement of practical measures of effectiveness of administration in institutions of higher education. The questionnaires served as the basis of a set of case studies undertaken simultaneously in 19 volunteer institutions during March-May, 1974. The questionnaires are presented, together with their instructions, dealing with departmental procedures and an information sheet providing data on basic statistics of the institution, its formal structure, its status relative to environmental constraints, the state of management technology, and the faculty and departments. An additional administrative questionnaire and one on contingency studies, which should provide some basis for direct objective comparison between the processes of administration at different level of higher education, are also provided. A glossary is included. (LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED116554

centre for educational research and innovation

PROGRAMME ON INSTITUTIONAL MANAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF ALTERNATIVE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES

Annex : Case Study Questionnaires

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 006 932

2

OECD ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC
CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Centre for Educational Research
and Innovation

Paris, 18th December, 1974
Or. Engl.

IMHE/GC/74.37

Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education

COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF ALTERNATIVE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES

Annex
Case Study Questionnaires

3

Second General Conference of Member Institutions
Paris January 20th-22nd, 1975.

10.137

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Note by the Secretariat	I
Investigator Notes	1
Departmental Procedures 1 Questionnaire	11
Departmental Procedures 2 Questionnaire	33
Administrative Questionnaire	49
Information Sheet	67
Contingency Studies	85
Glossary of Terms	113

Note by the Secretariat

At the First General Conference of Member Institutions of OECD's Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education in January, 1973, one of the two main themes for discussion was the effectiveness of university government and administration. This topic was chosen because it had been cited as a major concern of the members and, during the Conference, it quickly became apparent that very little, if any, previous research had been undertaken toward the development of concrete measures of effectiveness of administrative structures of universities and other higher educational institutions. Because of the overwhelming interest in this subject, the programme assigned a very high priority to initiating some research in this area. As a result, a pilot study was initiated in May, 1973, the results of which are reported on in the volume entitled "Comparative Effectiveness of Alternative Administrative Structures". This volume is an annex to the main report.

As part of the project, a set of detailed questionnaires were developed to test a number of hypotheses related to the definition and measurement of practical measures of effectiveness of administration in institutions of higher education. These questionnaires, after initial testing at the University of Sussex and subsequent revision following comments received by participants drawn from different OECD countries who attended a meeting in Paris in February, 1974, formed the basis of a set of case studies undertaken simultaneously in 19 volunteer institutions during the period March-May, 1974. The complete package of materials consisted of the following :

- Investigator Notes
- Departmental Procedures 1 Questionnaire (10 copies)
- Departmental Procedures 2 Questionnaire (10 copies)
- Administrative Questionnaire (3 copies)
- Information Sheet
- Contingency Studies
- Glossary of Terms

Each of the components listed above is reproduced in this annex. The project was carried out by a research team in the Department of Operational Research at the University of Sussex comprising Professor B.H.P. Rivett, who had overall responsibility for the project and Dr. A.W. Palmer and Mr. C.J. Johnson, who were the principal researchers for the project. In addition, during the period February-June, 1974, Mr. P.A. Rose was appointed to assist with the analysis and interpretation of the results. For full details about the project, readers are asked to consult the main report.

INVESTIGATOR NOTES

The accompanying package contains six separate items identified by their cover titles as :-

(1) QUESTIONNAIRE DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES 1

(2) QUESTIONNAIRE DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES 11

(3) INFORMATION SHEET

(4) ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

(5) CONTINGENCY STUDIES

(6) GLOSSARY

Details of these units and the procedures associated with each are outlined separately in the following pages. The timetable associated with these procedures is given below.

PROJECT TIMETABLE

<table>
<tr><td>1st Week</td><td rowspan="3">General Information Sheet and Administrative Questionnaires To be completed</td><td rowspan="3">Establish contacts with Department</td></tr>
<tr><td>2nd Week</td></tr>
<tr><td>3rd Week</td></tr>
<tr><td>4th Week</td><td></td><td rowspan="2">Departmental Studies to be completed</td></tr>
<tr><td>5th Week</td><td>Preparation for Contingency studies</td></tr>
<tr><td>6th Week</td><td rowspan="2">Contingency Studies to be completed</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>7th Week</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>8th Week</td><td>Assemble and send off final sections of study</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

QUESTIONNAIRE. DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES 1

This Questionnaire has been designed to provide information regarding the effectiveness of some departmental procedures. Mostly these are associated with those involving teaching and research activities.

(1) To be completed by

Full time teaching staff of science departments including heads of department

Notes: Some of the questions may only be answerable by head of departments. Other staff leave these blank. This is pointed out in the introduction and has not caused confusion in the pilot studies.

(2) Completion Time

[illegible] - 45 minutes.

(3) Means of Administering

The questions can be completed either as part of an interview schedule OR as a postal questionnaire WITHOUT the presence of the investigator.

QUESTIONNAIRE. DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES 2

The questionnaire is designed to provide information about the following particular measures of administrative effectiveness and structure: centralisation of authority; formality of standardisation of administrative procedures; degrees of role specialisation, specification and supervision; committee measures; information flows; involvement of academics in administration; climates of confidence, co-operativeness and understanding between academia and administration; speed and quality of decision-making procedures; adaptability and flexibility of the system; various efficiencies, such as freedom of academics from routine chores; general satisfaction with administration; and a few others.

(1) To be completed by

Full time academic staff of science departments excluding heads of departments.

(2) Completion Time

30 - 60 minutes.

(3) Means of Administering

The questions are to be completed as a postal questionnaire

(4) Notes

The questions are designed to be completed at a rapid, impressionistic level and this should be emphasized in any queries concerning the nature of the questions.

INFORMATION SHEET

Section 1 requests information about the general constitution of the institution. It is likely that the investigator will be able to obtain the information necessary to complete this from general statistical or information officers at his institution; and/or from official organisational charts; and/or from interviewing a couple of central administrators (such as, for instance, the planning officer).

Section 11 requests information specific to the Faculty and Department around which the study is to centre. Where the sources of information for Section 1 fail, the investigator may supplement his knowledge by consulting the branch of administration dealing specifically with that Faculty and Department, or by interviewing the Heads of these units.

(1) To be completed by

The chief investigator

(2) Completion Time

First 3 weeks of project

(3) Means of Administering

Personal investigation by the chief investigator

(4) Notes

In any event, where these recommendations fail, it is left up to the investigator's personal initiative to provide as much as possible of the information requested. "Information unobtainable" should be written in wherever the data requested proves too difficult to find.

Besides the possibility of unobtainable data, it may be the case that some of the information requested simply does not apply to the investigator's institution. In such an instance, the investigator should explain this in a qualifying remark.

Figures given in the information sheet should apply to the academic year 1972/73 wherever possible. This is not important, however, so long as the year for which the data is valid is not before 1971.

Throughout this Information Sheet, refer to the Glossary for definitions of terms used.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire is divided into three sections :

Section I provides basic information on the nature of the administrative work carried out by the respondent.

Section II is designed to provide information about the structure of the institution's administration as perceived by the respondent. In particular, the questionnaire is geared to test the applicability and relevance of the following measures of administrative structure: the centralisation of authority; the formality and standardisation of administrative procedures; the degree of role specification within administration; the unity (psychological and physical) of the administration; the importance of informality in processes; the pressure on the individual within the system; the climate of confidence and understanding between administrators and academics; the job satisfactions within administration; the adaptability and flexibility of the administration; degrees of communication; and one or two others.

Section III requests concrete information regarding communications between various factions of the institution.

(1) To be completed by

Non-academic administrators

Notes

It is intended that two of the questionnaires be completed by administrative staff directly concerned with the physical and political co-ordination of Faculties, Departments, and individual academics. (This would include such activities as allocation of office space, allocation of equipment, staff remuneration, student admissions, student records, the scheduling of lectures and examinations, the conferring of Degrees, program budgeting, etc.)

The third questionnaire is to be completed by an administrator whose duties do not relate so directly to academic affairs. Ideally he should be working in some very different branch of administration, such as building maintenance, catering or administering a health service. The general intention is that his administrative occupation be divergent from the occupations of the other two administrators sampled, and any choice in line with this is permissible.

(2) Completion Time

60 minutes.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE (Continued)

(3) Means of Administering

The questions are to be completed as a postal questionnaire.

(4) Notes

The questions are designed to be completed at a rapid, impressionistic level and this should be emphasized in any queries concerning the nature of the questions.

CONTINGENCY STUDIES

The Contingency Studies section of the package is designed to provide specific information about the working processes of administration. Without such information, the study as a whole will necessarily be diminished. Nevertheless, in view of the possible difficulties which some institutions may have in completing the whole package, this section may be considered as optional.

Completion of the Contingency Studies will depend heavily upon the investigators interest and initiative. The technique presented is novel, and tailored to suit a comparative study. Comments as to whether or not the investigator considers it a workable or potentially workable methodology would be valuable.

To be completed by

Chief investigator

Completion time

Last 2½ weeks of project

Means of Administering

Personal research, interviews, improvised methods.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

The Glossary of Terms contain brief explanations of some of the terms used in the various questionnaire and information sheets. The terms listed are those whose specific meaning may differ in a cross cultural comparison e.g. Faculty, or those which need an expanded description relating to the context in which they are used.

USE

It is intended that use of the glossary is normally confined to the investigator. Thus before handing out any material he should read through the questions asked and ensure (via the glossary) that the terms or their translations are meaningful and applicable within his own institution.

QUESTIONNAIRE

DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES 1

INTRODUCTION

This questionnaire has been designed to provide information regarding some procedures associated with the teaching and research activities of various departments. The topics covered are by no means exhaustive and the main purpose of the questions is to obtain information regarding procedural differences that may exist, at the departmental level, between various institutions of higher education.

Generally the answers to the questions will represent opinions and attitudes rather than objective statements. If you find that some of the reply categories do not fully encompass your own viewpoint, it would be appreciated if you would explain this in the spaces provided.

Most of the questions should be relevant for the full time teaching staff of a science department, but one or two of the questions may require a knowledge of administrative procedure that only a head of department is familiar with. If you find that you are unable to answer a question because of lack of information please write information not available and proceed to the next one.

Thank you for your co-operation.

(A) Given that an aim or objective of your department is to provide teaching (at all levels) would you please indicate how important you think this activity is regarded by your department * on the whole at present.

* Not yourself

Please place a tick in Table (1) below.

Table (1) TEACHING - IMPORTANCE TO DEPARTMENT

Of very great importance	
Of considerable importance	
Of moderate importance	
Just about important	
Of mild importance	
Of little or no importance	

Please add below any qualifying remarks or explanations you may wish to make.

(B) Please consider the list of subjects taught by your department. The assumption could be made that this list is a result of compromise decisions between :

a) topics to be taught - determined, for example, by professional opinion of what constitutes satisfactory subject matter and also the requests of other departments etc.

and b) the staff available for teaching

For example, professional opinion (including your own) may have desired a more diverse range of subjects or perhaps a more advanced treatment of certain topics; and these may have been omitted to some extent because of lack of staff. Such a situation would constitute a staff-subject compromise. On the other hand, a more important limitation on the list of subjects may have been the lack of available student time. This would not constitute a staff - subject compromise.

Please indicate below to what extent you think the list of subjects taught by your department represents a compromise between lack of staff and subjects taught, by placing a tick in the appropriate row of Table 2.

Table (2) STAFF - SUBJECT COMPROMISE

Yes, the list very much represents a compromise between subjects and staff available	
Yes, to some extent the list represents a compromise between subjects and staff available	
To a minor extent the list represents a compromise between subjects and staff available	
No. Other considerations* were much more important than a compromise between subjects and staff available	
I don't know or have no opinion.	

* e.g. Time available, space, laboratory use, etc.

Please add below any qualifying remarks or explanations you may wish to make.

(C) Please consider the teaching allocation of lecturers to subjects in your department.

Generally, and as far as possible, the subjects taught relate to the research interests or qualifications of the lecturer teaching the particular subjects. Sometimes however the ideally qualified staff are not available and lecturers have to broaden their teaching range.

Assuming, however, that an unlimited number of extra staff were available and they were qualified in any areas you wished, would you please :

(a) List below those subjects <u>currently taught</u>, where you think the additional specialists could make valuable contributions.

(b) List over any <u>additional</u> subjects you think ought to be taught

(c) List over any replacement subjects you think ought to be taught, together with the subjects they replace.

(Would you please also indicate over, the degree of importance you would attach to these changes if they could be made)

(a) SUBJECTS CURRENTLY TAUGHT - BUT FURTHER CONTRIBUTIONS BY ADDITIONAL STAFF WOULD BE VALUABLE

Current subjects that would benefit by extra staff	Importance of additional specialised staff		
	Very Necessary	Necessary	Desirable but not necessary

(b) ADDITIONAL SUBJECTS THAT WOULD BE TAUGHT

Additional Subjects (If staff available)	Importance of these subjects given staff available		
	Very Necessary	Necessary	Desirable but not necessary

(c) SUBJECTS THAT WOULD BE REPLACED

It is possible that some subjects are taught mainly because particular staff are knowledgeable in those areas, and if more staff were available such subjects would be removed from the syllabus in order to allow time for more relevant material.

If this is the case would you please fill in Table (c) below. If you do not wish to identify the subject please refer to it as subject X etc.

Subjects (if any) that would be removed (if extra staff available)	Importance of REMOVAL (given staff available)		
	Very necessary	Necessary	Desirable but not necessary

(D) Here we are concerned with decisions that may well have a strong influence within your department but are primarily made by people external to your department. For example consider the decision making body, assembly or individuals who decide on the actual allocation of teaching staff to your own department.

Would you please indicate below by whom such a decision is officially or formally made

i. By an individual ? Yes No If yes in what capacity or official position ? .....

ii. By a Committee ? Yes No If yes is the decision arrived by : a) vote Please tick
b) chairman deciding " "
c) other. Please specify .....

.....

.....

(E) Although the replies given above may represent the formal state of affairs, it often happens that decision making processes are strongly influenced by informal links, strong personalities etc. For example in some Universities it may be that the office or role of Dean is synomonous with a particular decision function which is independent of WHO the occupant is. In others a similar decision may be a strong function of the attitudes or philosophy of the PERSON who occupies the role of Dean. Or, in the case of a committee, it may be that one of its members is of high academic status and hence may be accorded an influential role in an administrative decision making capacity even though this would not, perhaps, represent the formal state of affairs.

Perhaps you could indicate over to what extent you consider less formalized procedures are evident for the particular decision of staff allocation to your department.

Please tick all the statements which you think are generally applicable to decisions associated with STAFF ALLOCATION TO YOUR DEPARTMENT

RULES	
(a) There are little or few established rules or criteria of importance	
(b) There are some established rules or criteria of importance	
(c) There are many established rules or criteria of importance	
DECISION MAKING ROLES	
(d) Decisions are almost invariably made by the occupants of the official decision making roles or posts	
(e) On average decisions are made by the occupants of the official decision making roles or posts	
(f) On average decisions are not* made by the occupants of the official decision making roles	
(g) Decisions are almost invariably not made by the occupants of the official decision making roles	
(h) On average it seems that the decisions are equally distributed between occupants of the official decision making roles and others	

* e.g. By those other than the occupants of the official decision making roles - e.g. forceful personalities, acknowledged 'wise' men, respected academics, etc.

Please add below any qualifying remarks or explanations you may wish to make.

(F) We would like to know something about the rewards and sanctions that are associated with your job. These may be internal or external; for example it could be that you become aware that you are giving a series of bad lectures, and that this awareness may provide a sufficient motivational force for you to introduce changes. On the other hand you may receive information from students or colleagues or perhaps the head of your department; all of which would have varying reward value either positive or negative.

First however we would like to consider the SOURCES of your information.

Would you please indicate (by placing appropriate ticks in the columns of Table 3 below) the degree to which you use the information sources given regarding your TEACHING ROLE ONLY.

Table 3. INFORMATION SOURCES. TEACHING PERFORMANCE

Degree to which source is used	Sources of feedback information			
	Students	Head of Dept.	Academic Staff	Self Awareness
Very much				
Often				
Sometimes				
Rarely				
Practically never				

Please add below any qualifying remarks or explanations you may wish to make.

(G) Would you also indicate (by placing appropriate ticks in the columns of Table 4 below) the general or average level of the degree of informality associated with the information sources you have just mentioned. e.g. A regular assessment or questionnaire regarding teaching performance would be classified as a well defined formal procedure, whereas a casual remark during a coffee break would be classified as a chance or very informal occurrence.

Table 4. FORMALITY/INFORMALITY OF INFORMATION SOURCES ASSOCIATED WITH REGARDING TEACHING PERFORMANCE

Formality/Informality of Source	Sources of feedback information			
	Students	Head of Dept	Academic Staff	Personal Awareness *
Well defined, official or formal procedure				
Few rules, generally accepted and expected procedure				
Haphazard, chance occurrences, very informal				

* Of course if your information source is mainly your self perception then some of the formality categories may not be applicable. In this case please write N.A.

Please add below any qualifying remarks or explanations you may wish to make.

(H) Having considered the various channels of information used regarding teaching performance, would you now please undertake a similar grading regarding the IMPORTANCE OF EACH SOURCE TO YOU WITH RESPECT TO ITS REWARD VALUE - POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE. For example you might consider the approval of the head of your department or formal figure in authority, to have a positive value and dissapproval to have a negative value; and these values may differ if originating from other sources such as your colleagues.

In completing Table 5 below would you please consider the source with respect to POSITIVE REWARDS i.e. praise, congratulatory information etc., and place a tick in the appropriate rows to indicate the degree of importance to you of the sources indicated (and of course include your self awareness or respect as a source if you wish).

Table 5. IMPORTANCE OF SOURCE REGARDING POSITIVE REWARDS - TEACHING

Importance of source to you	Sources of POSITIVE rewards to yourself. Teaching				
	Students	Head of Dept	Academic Staff	Self	Other *
Of the greatest importance					
Of considerable importance					
Of moderate importance					
Just about important					
Of mild concern					
Of little or no concern					

* Please specify

Please add below any qualifying remarks or explanations you may wish to make.

(J) In completing Table 6 below would you please consider the source with respect to NEGATIVE REWARDS i.e. dissapproval, complaints, reprimands, etc.

Table 6. IMPORTANCE OF SOURCE REGARDING NEGATIVE REWARDS - TEACHING

Importance of source to you	Sources of NEGATIVE rewards to yourself. Teaching				
	Students	Head of Dept	Academic Staff	Self**	Other*
Of the greatest importance					
Of considerable importance					
Of moderate importance					
Just about important					
Of mild concern					
Of little or no concern					

* Please specify

** Here the importance of self as a source of negative rewards would be associated with the dissatisfaction you felt at your teaching performance

Please add below any qualifying remarks or explanations you may wish to make.

(K) Given that an aim or objective of your department is to UNDERTAKE RESEARCH, would you please indicate how important you think this activity is regarded by your department * on the whole at present

* Not yourself

Please place a tick in Table (7) below.

Table (7) RESEARCH

Of very great importance	
Of considerable importance	
Of moderate importance	
Just about important	
Of mild importance	
Of little or no importance	

Please add below any qualifying remarks or explanations you may wish to make.

(L) Again we are concerned with decisions that may well have a strong influence within your department but are primarily made by people external to your department. For example consider the decision making body, assembly or individuals who decide on the actual allocation of capital equipment funds to your own department.

Would you please indicate below by whom such a decision is officially or formally made

i. By an individual ? Yes No If yes in what capacity or official position ? .....

ii. By a committee ? Yes No If yes, is the decision arrived by : a) vote Please tick

b) chairman deciding " "

c), other. Please specify: .....

.....

.....

(M) Although the replies given above may represent the formal state of affairs, it often happens that decision making process are strongly influenced by informal links, strong personalities, etc. Perhaps you could indicate over to what extent you think this is evident for the particular decision of allocation of capital equipment funds to your department.

Here please regard the terms role occupants, decision makers etc. in a similar manner to that in which you gave your views concerning the decision of staff allocation.

Please tick all the statements which you think are generally applicable to decisions associated with ALLOCATION OF CAPITAL EQUIPMENT FUNDS

RULES	
(a) There are little or few established rules or criteria of importance	
(b) There are some established rules or criteria of importance	
(c) There are many established rules or criteria of importance	
DECISION MAKING ROLES	
(d) Decisions are almost invariably made by the occupants of the official decision making roles or posts	
(e) On average decisions are made by the occupants of the official decision making roles or posts	
(f) On average decisions are not* made by the occupants of the official decision making roles	
(g) Decisions are almost invariably not made by the occupants of the official decision making roles	
(h) On average it seems that the decisions are equally distributed between occupants of the official decision making roles and others	

* e.g. By those other than the occupants of the official decision making roles - e.g. forceful personalities, acknowledged 'wise' men, respected academics, etc.

Please add below any qualifying remarks or explanations you may wish to make.

(N) Again we would like to know something about the rewards and sanctions that are associated with your job. These may be internal or external; for example it could be that you become aware that your research is of good or of poor standard, and that this awareness may provide a sufficient motivational force for you to introduce changes. On the other hand you may receive information from research students or colleagues or perhaps the head of your department; all of which would have varying reward value either positive or negative.

First however we would like to consider the SOURCES of your information.

Would you please indicate (by placing appropriate ticks in the columns of Table 8 below) the degree to which you use the information sources given, regarding your RESEARCH ABILITIES ONLY.

Table 8. INFORMATION SOURCES. PERSONAL RESEARCH ABILITY

Degree to which source is used	Sources of feedback information					
	Students (Research)	Head of Dept	Academic Staff (including other Universities)	Personal observation/ awareness	Published Material	Other *
Very much						
Often						
Sometimes						
Rarely						
Practically never						

Please add below any qualifying remarks or explanations you may wish to make

---

(O) Would you also indicate (by placing appropriate ticks in the columns of Table 9 below) the general or average level of the degree of informality of the information sources you have just mentioned.

Table 9. FORMALITY/INFORMALITY OF INFORMATION SOURCES REGARDING PERSONAL RESEARCH ABILITY

Formality/ Informality of Source	Sources of feedback information					
	Students (Research)	Head of Dept.	Academic Staff (incl. other Universities)	Personal * observation/ awareness	Published Material	Other **
Well defined, formal procedure						
Few rules, generally normally accepted procedure						
Haphazard, chance occurrences, very informal						

* Of course if your information source is mainly your self perception then some of the formality categories may not be applicable. In this case please write N.A.

** Please specify

Please add below any qualifying remarks or explanations you may wish to make.

_____

_____

_____

_____

(P) Having considered the various channels of information used regarding research performance would you now please undertake a similar grading regarding the IMPORTANCE OF EACH SOURCE TO YOU WITH RESPECT TO ITS REWARD VALUE - POSITIVE & NEGATIVE. For example you might consider the approval of the head of your department or formal figure in authority, to have a positive value and dissapproval to have a negative value; and these values may differ if originating from other sources such as your colleagues.

In completing Table 10 below would you please consider the source with respect to POSITIVE REWARDS i.e. praise, congratulating information etc., and place a tick in the appropriate rows to indicate the degree of importance to you of the sources indicated (and of course include your self awareness or respect as a source if you wish - under personal observation.

Table 10. IMPORTANCE OF SOURCE REGARDING POSITIVE REWARDS - RESEARCH

Importance of source to you.	Sources of POSITIVE rewards to yourself. Research					
	Students (Research)	Head of Dept	Academic Staff (incl. other Universities)	Personal observation/ awareness	Published Material	Other*
Of the utmost importance						
Of considerable importance						
Of moderate importance						
Just about important						
Of mild concern						
Of little or no concern						

* Please specify

Please add below any qualifying remarks or explanations you may wish to make.

(Q) In completing Table 11 below would you please consider the source with respect to NEGATIVE REWARDS i.e. dissapproval, complaints, reprimands, etc.

Table 11. IMPORTANCE OF SOURCE REGARDING NEGATIVE REWARDS - RESEARCH

Importance of source to you.	Sources of NEGATIVE rewards to yourself. Research					
	Students (Research)	Head of Dept	Academic Staff (incl. other Universities)	Personal observation/ awareness	Published Material	Other*
Of the utmost importance						
Of considerable importance						
Of moderate importance						
Just about important						
Of mild concern						
Of little or no concern						

* Please specify

Please add below any qualifying remarks or explanations you may wish to make.

(R) In the tables that follow we are again considering teaching and research activities but the concern here is with the degree of communication. We would like to have some idea of how frequently you communicate with your head of department and peers on various topics. A communication is regarded as the transmission of information via any channel, e.g. oral, written etc. and is assumed to take place in 'incidents' i.e. a meeting, report, telephone conversation etc.

In Tables 12 and 13 would you please try and give your impression of the average frequency of occurrence of these 'incidents' or interactions for you personally and only for the topics mentioned, first with your head of department and second with other peer members of the department.

Table 12. Interaction with HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

Topic	Average frequency of interaction with HEAD OF DEPARTMENT					
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Termly	Yearly	Almost Never
Syllabus/Timetable						
Student Progress						
Quality/Progress of Lectures						
Current Research *						

Table 13. Interaction with DEPARTMENTAL PEERS

Topic	Average frequency of interaction with DEPARTMENTAL PEERS					
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Termly	Yearly	Almost Never
Syllabus/Timetable						
Student Progress						
Quality/Progress of Lectures						
Current Research *						

* Nature of work, progress, changes in, etc.

QUESTIONNAIRE

DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES 2

INTRODUCTION TO DEPARTMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE

As an academic in your Department, certainly some or most of your energies will be channelled into research and/or teaching. These portions of your work we name "academic activities". In addition, you will presumably be to some extent involved in other chores and procedures such as processing student applications, writing reports on students' progress, organising seminars and tutorials, amending or approving or writing syllabi for certain courses, expressing opinion about and influencing Departmental concerns by written notes or at some committee meeting.., etc. All such diverse occupations we name "administrative activities".

This questionnaire constitutes part of a larger study into the comparative effectiveness of administrative structures in higher education. In particular it is concerned with the effectiveness of administrative structures at the Departmental level. For these reasons, it would be of the greatest assistance to the study if you could complete the following questionnaire, having regard to all administrative activities which involve yourself.

The questionnaire is designed to provide information about the following particular measures of administrative effectiveness and structure: centralisation of authority; formality and standardisation of administrative procedures; degrees of role specialisation, specification, and supervision; committee measures; information flows; involvement of academics in administration; climates of confidence, co-operativeness and understanding between academia and administration; speed and quality of decision-making procedures; adaptability and flexibility of the system; various efficiencies, such as freedom of academics from routine chores; general satisfaction with administration; and a few others.

Thank you for your co-operation in this part of the study.
Your replies will, of course, be treated with the strictest confidence.

This section contains (i) a list of statements (ii) a reply sheet and (iii) comment sheets.

Read through the list of statements, considering each of them as applied to your role and situation in the institution. You are asked to grade each statement into one of the five categories.

Definitely true
Mostly true
Neither true nor false (or irrelevant)
Mostly false
Definitely false

In making these gradings please try to complement direct knowledge and experience with a degree of judgment: the statements were not designed to be taken too literally and it would be helpful if you would reply in an impressionistic manner to some of the questions.

For each question, your grading is to be marked in the appropriate place on the reply sheet. Additional or qualifying remarks can be made on the comment sheets.

Note In the questionnaire, the following definitions apply:

A Faculty is a major educational bloc within the institution, e.g. Faculty of Arts, Faculty of Social Science, Faculty of Medicine, etc. (The term faculty is not applied to academic staff).

A Department is a relatively specialist subject group located within some Faculty. e.g. Department of Chemistry and Department of Physics may be located with the Faculty of Pure Science.

A committee is any group of people who meet with some common purpose and have the ability to act collectively in some sense.

Academic staff refers to all teaching and research staff of all grades, including assistants.

Administrative staff (administrators) refers to all personnel appointed specifically to assist the administrative function of the institution, both the central administration and that of Faculties and Departments.

A course of instruction is one term or semester's instruction on a particular topic.

(i) List of Statements

The numbering of the following statements is used for identification purposes in the reply sheet.

1. I have a fair say in Departmental decisions.
2. Apart from teaching hours, I am free to deploy my time as I see fit.
3. Departmental decisions are mostly taken by the Head of the Department.
4. Departmental decisions are mostly taken by a committee.
5. In the making and taking of Departmental decisions, informal processes have greater effect than formal processes.
6. Faculty decisions are mostly taken by one or two individuals.
7. Faculty decisions are mostly taken by some committee.
8. In the making and taking of faculty decisions, informal processes have greater effect than formal processes.
9. I am a member of two or more committees.
10. Most of the time I spend at committee meetings is wasted.
11. I am a member of a committee which contains both academics and administrators.
12. The institution contains large clumsy governing bodies with dozens of committees that irregularly meet, or when they do nothing much is accomplished.
13. I am not really involved with administrative processes.
14. I spend too much of my time on administrative chores.
15. I am not much involved in Departmental or Faculty decision making
16. I usually lunch with my academic colleagues.
17. Lunch time is sometimes given to informal working discussions.
18. The supervision of my work, such as it is, is largely informal.
19. There is some conflict between the interests of different members of my Department.
20. There is a good team spirit within the Department.
21. Most academics are pre-occupied with their personal careers

22. Other Departmental members express little interest in my work.

23. The Department is united in commonly understood goals.

24. I feel I make a meaningful contribution to the Department.

25. I feel I make a meaningful contribution to the institution as a whole.

26. I feel my job is beneficial to society.

27. I am satisfied with my career prospects.

28. I am satisfied with my salary.

29. If I were dissatisfied with my job, the only effective remedy would be for me to leave it.

30. On the whole, I am satisfied with my job.

31. Administrative processes could be much less clumsy than they are at present.

32. There are many diverse links between central Administration and particular Faculties, Departments and individual academics.

33. Communication between central administration and particular Faculties, Departments and individual academics is almost entirely channelled through a particular office and/or a few individuals.

Note - in the following statements, by "decisions" we mean decisions affecting the Department or possibly the Faculty.

34. Decisions are taken on a professional and well-informed basis.

35. Decisions take too long being made.

36. Decisions are rarely taken by the people most affected by them.

37. The real merits of a proposal often have little influence on whether the proposal is accepted or rejected.

38. In making and taking decisions, political ability is more important than common sense.

39. Decisions are often amateur, ill-informed, or ad hoc.

40. There is adequate consultation in decision processes.

---

41. I rarely have any communication at all with administrators.

42. I sometimes ask advice of an administrator

43. I am friendly with an administrator.

44. My activities often bring me into verbal (includes telephone) contact with an administrator.

45. I understand the frustrations which confront administrators in the institution.

46. Administrators often write to me requesting or giving some information.

47. My communication (such as it is) with administrators is mostly indirect (e.g. via the Head of Department).

48. I consider administration a necessary evil.

49. I avoid all unnecessary contact with Administration.

50. Academics and administrators in general tend to keep contact with each other at a bare minimum.

51. I feel that administrators have confidence in and comprehension of the goals and actions of academics.

52. I have confidence in and comprehension of the goals and actions of administrators.

53. I am pre-disposed to regard an administrative communication as a potentially unwanted intrusion.

54. My academic problems are such that I have little time or energy for administrative activity.

55. I am grateful for the services of administrators.

56. When I communicate with administrators it is nearly always in a formal capacity.

57. I find it awkward relating to and informally communicating with most administrators.

58. There is a general spirit of co-operation between academics and administrators.

59. Academics and administrators co-operate effectively in commonly understood goals.

Note - the following group of statements (Nos. 60 - 70) concern your teaching activities. If you have no teaching duties, do not respond to this group of statements.

60. I have a free hand in choosing the detailed content of the courses I teach.

61. I have a great say in the construction of the syllabi for the courses I teach.

62. I have a free hand in choosing the methods I employ to teach and to assess students.

63. I must grade each student in each course I teach.

64. I must write formal reports on some students' progress.

65. There is a formal procedure by which my teaching performance is assessed.

66. I am sometimes informally advised by my academic peers as to how I might improve my teaching.

67. If a student does not consider my teaching satisfactory, he may make some formal appeal or protest to an individual or body which has powers over me.

68. Students almost always accept my teaching without complaint.

69. There is a good informal relationship between my students and myself

70. My teaching is not effectively supervised.

71. My teaching benefits often from informal discussion with other members of my Department.

72. Teaching is generally regarded as a chore rather than an academically fulfilling occupation.

73. Within my Department, teaching is allocated on a formal logistic basis. (That is to say, according to some numerate rule specifying total number of teaching hours per academic staff member per year, or some similar rule).

74. Within my Department, teaching is allocated informally by the Head of the Department.

75. What I teach could be taught capably by most of the other members of the Department.

76. Each of the courses I teach could be capably taught by some other member of the Department.

77. In terms of my teaching performance, I am accountable to a particular individual (e.g. the Head of Department).

78. In terms of my teaching performance, I am accountable to a group of people (e.g. a Departmental committee).

Note - the remaining statements (nos 79 - 91) concern your research activities. If you do not engage in research, do not respond to this group of statements.

79. My research is almost always personal. That is to say, I am not usually one member of a research team, but collaborate with at most one other person

80. I am free to do whatever research I want to do.

81. I often do research under contract and for material gain.

82. I often do research purely because of my personal interest in a topic.

83. If I did less research, my professional status within the Department would drop significantly.

84. Research output is essential to my career prospects.

85. I consider an academic is best judged according to his research output

86. I do not have time to do much of the research I would like to do.

87. I am aided in my research by assistants and/or students.

88. My allocation of research assistants/students is according to a formal set of rules.

89. If I wanted another research assistant/student I could probably obtain one.

90. I must write formal reports on my research activities.

91. I often seek informal advice about my research from other Departmental members

(ii) REPLY SHEET

Statement Number	Definitely True	Mostly True	Neither true nor false (or irrelevant)	Mostly false	Definitely false
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
29					
30					
31					
32					
33					
34					
35					

(ii) REPLY SHEET (Continued)

Statement Number	Definitely True	Mostly True	Neither true nor false (or irrelevant)	Mostly false	Definitely false
36					
37					
38					
39					
40					
41					
42					
43					
44					
45					
46					
47					
48					
49					
50					
51					
52					
53					
54					
55					
56					
57					
58					
59					
60					
61					
62					
63					
64					
65					
66					
67					
68					
69					
70					

(ii) REPLY SHEET (Continued)

Statement Number	Definitely True	Mostly True	Neither true nor false (or irrelevant)	Mostly false	Definitely false
71					
72					
73					
74					
75					
76					
77					
78					
79					
80					
81					
82					
83					
84					
85					
86					
87					
88					
89					
90					
91					

COMMUNICATION SURVEY

(i) Estimate the entries in the following table as realistically as you can,

This survey refers to all written communications received by you from any other person * or office in the institution in the period of one week.

* Excluding only your personal secretary

Notes: An "uninformative, valueless" communication generally goes straight into the waste bin and leaves you the same as if you had not received it.

An "informative, no response" communication tells you something of interest or value, but requires no action on your part.

An "informative, response" communication not only tells you something of interest or value, but also requires some action on your part (e.g. a reply, or adjusting your time table etc.)

Source		Total No. of Communications	Uninformative Valueless	Informative No Response	Informative Response
Administration	Official				
	Informal				
Academics	Official				
	Informal				
Other internal mail					

Qualifying Remarks (It would be helpful if you could indicate which of the activities listed in Section I accounted for the greatest proportions of the above communications) :

(ii) In carrying out your work, how often do you use the following channels in communicating with other administrators and with academics:

Note: Here we are interested in relative frequencies. Thus if you communicate with academics very rarely, but when you do it is nearly always by means of a written note, then you should tick the box "very frequent" for written communication with academics.

	ADMINISTRATORS					ACADEMICS				
CHANNEL OF COMMUNICATION	VERY FREQUENT	FREQUENT	SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	VERY FREQUENT	FREQUENT	SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER
DIRECT MEETING										
GROUP MEETING e,g.COMMITTEE										
TELEPHONE										
WRITTEN										
OTHER (SPECIFY)										

Qualifying remarks:

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

.GENERAL INFORMATION ON QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire is divided into three sections :

Section I provides basic information on the nature of the administrative work carried out by the respondent.

Section II is designed to provide information about the structure of the institution's administration as perceived by the respondent. In particular, the questionnaire is geared to test the applicability and relevance of the following measures of administrative structure : the centralisation of authority; the formality and standardisation of administrative procedures; the degree of role specification within administration; the unity (psychological and physical) of the administration; the importance of informality in processes; the pressure on the individual within the system; the climate of confidence and understanding between administrators and academics; the job satisfactions within administration; the adaptability and flexibility of the administration; degrees of communication; and one or two others.

Section III requests concrete information regarding communications between various factions of the institution.

Data gathered from this questionnaire will be used as part of a larger study into the comparative effectiveness of alternative administrative structures in institutions of higher education throughout Europe.

Replies to all sections of the questionnaire will, of course, remain strictly confidential. Thank you very much for your co-operation in this study.

I. INFORMATION REQUEST

Write in the table below a concise list of the administrative activities for which you are responsible. Against each activity indicate the approximate percentage of working time spent on it.

Note: Do not divide your work into functional segments such as writing letters, attending committees etc., but into particular responsibilities such as maintaining student records, scheduling lecture rooms, organising Degree ceremonies, etc.

ACTIVITY	ESTIMATED % TIME

11. QUESTIONNAIRE

This section contains (i) a list of statements (ii) a reply sheet and (iii) comment sheets.

Read through the list of statements, considering each of them as applied to your role and situation in administration. You are asked to grade each statement into one of the five categories

Definitely true
Mostly true
Neither true nor false (or irrelevant)
Mostly false
Definitely false

In making these gradings please try to complement direct knowledge and experience with a degree of judgment: the statements were not designed with literal exactness in mind.

For each question, your grading is to be marked in the appropriate place on the reply sheet. Additional or qualifying remarks can be made on the comment sheets.

Notes: In the questionnaire, the following definitions apply.

A Faculty is a major educational bloc within the institution. e.g. Faculty of Arts, Faculty of Social Science, Faculty of Medicine, etc.
A Department is a relatively specialist subject group located within some Faculty. e.g. The Department of Chemistry and The Department of Physics located within the Faculty of Pure Science.
A Committee is any group of people who meet with some common purpose and have the ability to act collectively.
Academic staff refers to all teaching and research staff of all grades, including assistants.
Administrative staff (administrators) refers to all personnel appointed specifically to assist the administrative function of the institution, both the central administration and that of the Faculties and Departments.

(i) List of Statements

The numbering of the following statements is used for identification purposes in the reply sheet.

1. The activities listed in Section I provide a clear and complete account of my responsibilities.

2. Many of my activities are not sufficiently well-defined to be listed.

3. The activities listed in Section I are my officially recognised functions.

4. I engage in many informal activities which are not officially my responsibility.

5. Sometimes I am not sure whether a particular task which arises is my responsibility.

6. The activities in which I engage do not change much over the years.

7. The functions I carry out are subject to regular and formal reviews.

8. On the whole, I do what I am expected or instructed to do.

9. On the whole, I am free to carry out my work as I see fit.

10. My work is constantly supervised.

11. I am accountable for my work to a particular individual.

12. I am accountable for my work to a group of people.

13. I often ask advice of my administrative peers.

14. I must write regular written reports of my work.

15. If I were to work a little less efficiently, it probably would not be noticed.

16. I perform essential administrative tasks.

17. Situations rarely arise in which I am required to use initiative.

18. Most of my work consists in performing routine tasks.

19. I usually know what my work is to be at least a day in advance.

20. I rarely make decisions myself.

21. Decisions made at work usually follow standard guidelines.

22. My actions and options at work are mostly prescribed.

23. The administrative processes in which I am occupied are inflexible, allowing little room for improvisation.

24. I have a clear understanding of how the administration functions as a whole.

25. I sometimes ask advice of administrators from other branches of administration.

26. Personnel in other branches of administration do not understand my job.

27. Practically no other administrator is sufficiently trained to take over my job without at least one month's training.

28. I have never worked in other branches of administration.

29. My work rarely brings me into formal contact with other branches of administration.

30. The various branches of administration co-operate effectively as a unit.

31. There is some conflict between the interests of different branches of administration.

32. Different administrators usually understand each others' tasks well.

33. Different administrators are united in commonly understood goals.

34. There is a good team spirit within administration.

35. Most administrators are pre-occupied with their personal careers.

36. Within the scope of my activities, informal processes accomplish more than formal processes.

37. I often seek informal advice in carrying out my work.

38. Without informal inter-actions my work would be greatly handicapped.

39. The supervision of my work, such as it is, is largely informal.

40. My work is such that I rarely need to consult other people.

41. Other administrators express little interest in what I do.

42. I feel I make a meaningful contribution to administration as a whole.

43 I feel I make a meaningful contribution to the whole institution.

44. I feel my job is beneficial to society.

45. My job satisfaction depends greatly upon the approbation of administrative colleagues and peers.

46. I seem to spend all my day writing letters and making telephone calls.

47. I am satisfied with my career prospects.

48. I am satisfied with my salary.

49. I strongly believe in the value of higher education.

50. If an administrator were dissatisfied with his job, the only effective remedy would be for him to quit.

51. On the whole, I am satisfied with my job.

52. I sometimes ask advice of an academic.

53. I am friendly with more than one academic.

54. My activities often bring me into verbal contact (includes telephone) with an academic.

55. I understand the motivations of academics well.

56. I understand well the frustrations which confront academics in my institution.

57. I consider it one of my fundamental duties to assist and advise academics in any administrative matter of which I have knowledge.

58. Academics often write to me or consult me about some administrative matter.

59. My communication with academics is almost entirely via one or a few people holding official posts (e.g. Heads of Faculties or Departments).

60. When I communicate with academics, it is almost always in a formal capacity.

61. I find it awkward relating to and communicating with most academics.

62. There is a general spirit of co-operation between academics and administrators.

63. Academics and administrators co-operate effectively in commonly understood goals.

64. Academics tend to regard administrators as inferiors or menial helpers.

65. Academics do not understand the complexity and delicacy of administrative processes.

66. Academics tend to think of administration as a necessary evil.

67. Academics often criticize administration in my institution.

68. Academics often express gratitude for administrative services.

69. Many academics are too pre-occupied to appreciate administration.

70. If and when I initiate communication with an academic, there is a pre-disposition for one of us to view it as a potentially unwanted intrusion.

71. On the whole, I have confidence in the goals and actions of academics.

72. I feel that academics have confidence and comprehension of my own goals and actions.

73. I avoid all unnecessary contact with academics.

74. Academics and administrators tend to keep contact with each other at a bare minimum.

75. The institution contains large clumsy governing bodies with dozens of committees that irregularly meet, or when they do nothing much is accomplished.

76. In administration, decisions are taken on a professional and well-informed basis.

77. Administrative decisions take too long being made.

78. Administrative decisions are rarely taken by the people most affected by those decisions.

79. Administrative processes could be much less clumsy than they are at present.

80. The real merits of administrative proposals do not have a great influence on whether the proposals are accepted or rejected.

81. In my administration, political ability is more important than practical sense.

82. Administrative decisions are often amateur, ill-informed, or ad hoc.

83. I am a member of more than one committee.

84. I am a member of a committee which contains both administrators and academics.

85. I consider academics and administrators to be professional equals.

86. Most of the time I spend at committee meetings is wasted.

87. I often discuss my work informally with my colleagues.

88. I usually lunch with my colleagues.

89. Lunch time is sometimes given to informal working discussions.

90. There are many diverse links between central administration and particular Faculties.

91. Communication between central administration and particular Faculties is almost entirely channelled through a particular office or a few particular individuals.

(ii) REPLY SHEET

Statement Number.	Definitely true	Mostly true	Neither true nor false (or irrelevant)	Mostly false	Definitely false
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
29					
30					
31					
32					
33					
34					
35					

(Continued)

Statement Number.	Definitely true	Mostly true	Neither true nor false	Mostly false	Definitely false
36					
37					
38					
39					
40					
41					
42					
43					
44					
45					
46					
47					
48					
49					
50					
51					
52					
53					
54					
55					
56					
57					
58					
59					
60					
61					
62					
63					
64					
65					
66					
67					
68					
69					
70					
71					
72					
73					
74					

(Continued)

Statement Number.	Definitely true	Mostly true	Neither true nor false (or irrelevant)	Mostly false	Definitely false
75					
76					
77					
78					
79					
80					
81					
82					
83					
84					
85					
86					
87					
88					
89					
90					
91					

III. COMMUNICATION SURVEY

(i) Estimate the entries in the following table as realistically as you can,
This survey refers to all written communications received by you from any other person * or office in the institution in the period of one week.

* Excluding only your personal secretary

Notes: An "uninformative, valueless" communication generally goes straight into the waste bin and leaves you the same as if you had not received it.

An "informative, no response" communication tells you something of interest or value, but requires no action on your part.

An "informative, response" communication not only tells you something of interest or value, but also requires some action on your part (e.g. a reply, or adjusting your time table etc.)

Source		Total No. of Communications	Uninformative Valueless	Informative No Response	Informative Response
Administration	Official				
	Informal				
Academics	Official				
	Informal				
Other internal mail					

Qualifying Remarks (It would be helpful if you could indicate which of the activities listed in Section I accounted for the greatest proportions of the above communications) :

(ii) In carrying out your work, how often do you use the following channels in communicating with other administrators and with academics:

Note: Here we are interested in relative frequencies. Thus if you communicate with academics very rarely, but when you do it is nearly always by means of a written note, then you should tick the box "very frequent" for written communication with academics.

	ADMINISTRATORS					ACADEMICS				
CHANNEL OF COMMUNICATION	VERY FREQUENT	FREQUENT	SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	VERY FREQUENT	FREQUENT	SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER
DIRECT MEETING										
GROUP MEETING e.g.COMMITTEE										
TELEPHONE										
WRITTEN										
OTHER (SPECIFY)										

Qualifying remarks:

INFORMATION SHEET

I. THE TOTAL INSTITUTION

Name of institution .....

(i) Basic Statistics

Note: Refer to Glossary for definitions of terms used.

Total number of employees (includes academics, administrators, technicians, secretaries etc., but excludes students)	
Total number of academics	
Total number of administrative staff	
Number of secretarial appointments under administration	
Percentage of total academic staff in scientific/technological disciplines	
Number of First Degree students	
Number of Higher Degree students	
Total annual recurrent expenditure	
Gross remuneration for all academics	
Gross remuneration for all administrators	

Qualifying remarks :

(ii) The Institution's Formal Structure

A concise description of the institution's formal structure is required. This should be diagrammatic wherever possible, and contain reference to :

(a) Basic organisational divisions (into Areas, Faculties, Departments).
(b) Committees and User Groups
(c) Officers
(d) Administrative structure

To illustrate the detail and type of information required, example replies valid for the University of Sussex in England are enclosed.

(N.B. - The examples provided with original questionnaire have not been reproduced for this Annex.)

Note that the detailed inter-relationships between (a), (b), (c) and (d) are not required. This information should emerge from other parts of the study. Here we are concerned primarily with the patterns of heirarchical and horizontal organisation within the institution. Simplification is permissible, but an indication of this should be given in a qualifying remark.

For this section, you are requested to provide your own answer sheets.

In addition to the above, please answer the following question :

Is there, within central administration, one specific office or unit assigned the task of looking after the administrative affairs of :

	Yes	No
(a) One specific Faculty only ?		
(b) One specific Department only ?		

Is there, outside central administration, one specific office or unit assigned the task of looking after the administrative affairs of

	Yes	No
(a) One specific Faculty only		
(b) One specific Department only		

(iii) Status of Institution relative to Environmental Constraints

If exact figures for the following information are unobtainable, it is suggested that you try to get rough estimates of them from the parties in your institution most likely to know.

1. Recurrent Expenditure

Total annual recurrent expenditure (see glossary) is divided into gross remuneration of academics, gross remuneration of administrative staff (both excluding secretarial support) and "other" annual recurrent expenditure.

The sources of each type of annual recurrent expenditure we divide into four categories: direct state (national or local) grants; private donations, bequests, funds; self-generated funds such as student fees; and "other" sources.

In what approximate proportions are the three types of annual recurrent expenditure provided by the various sources ?

	Gross Remuneration of Academics (Approx. %)	Gross Remuneration of Administrators (Approx. %)	Other (Approx. %)
Direct State Grants			
Private			
Self-Generated			
Other (Please specify)			

Qualifying remarks :

.2. Capital Assets

By the "total capital assets" of your institution is meant the combined value of all the equipment, buildings, land, leases, etc., used by the institution.

Does your institution constitute a body capable of holding independent legal title (ownership) of any of its capital assets, and if so about what percentage of its capital assets are self-owned ? Or are all capital assets automatically state-owned ?

Yes, (indicate approximate % self-owned)	No, state-owned	Other (specify)

In the past, how important have private bequests/donations been in developing the institution ?

Very important	Important	Slightly important	Unimportant

Qualifying remarks :

3. Political Affairs

How many important officers are there in your institution in whose appointments the institution has little effective say ? And do these officers carry real powers or are they largely token posts ? (That is to say, could such officers seriously affect the processes of the university, if they had a mind to ?)

	One Officer	Two Officer	More than two
Real Powers			
Token Posts			

Is the political co-ordination of your institution well-defined by charter and/or constitution ? And if so, does this define voting and representation rights for major matters of policy and implementation ?

	Yes	No
Constitution/Charter		
Voting/Representation rights		

Qualifying remarks :

4. Competitive Climate

Does your institution effectively compete with others in attracting academics to work and teach there ?

Yes, a lot	Yes, a little	Not significant

Does your institution compete with others in attracting students; or are students allocated to you thus constituting a virtually guaranteed intake ? (Note: any statutory rule such as "all applicants with secondary school certificates must be accepted" is considered as a procedure for allocation).

Intake for:	Competitive	Guaranteed (by allocation)
First Degrees		
Higher Degrees		

Do students effectively compete for places at your institution, that is to say, are a significant number of applications likely to be rejected ?

Intake for:	Competitive	Non-Competitive
First Degrees		
Higher Degrees		

In your institution, approximately what proportions of students pay the costs of their maintenance and tuition ?

APPROX %

Students	Almost fully self-supporting	Partly self-supporting	Not self-supporting
First Degree			
Higher Degree			

What are the approximate drop-out rates for First Degree and Higher Degree students ? That is to say, about what percentage of students who enrol for a Degree fail to complete the course work ?

	Approx. drop-out rate
First Degree	
Higher Degree	

What approximate proportions of academic posts are :

	Approx. %
Permanent	
Probationary *	
Temporary	
Other	

* Probationary = temporary but renewable if performance is satisfactory.

Qualifying remarks :

5. Academic work.

Approximately what proportions of academics are engaged upon :

	Approx. %
Research mainly	
Teaching mainly	
Both the above, about equally	
Administrative affairs mainly	
Other.	

Approximately what proportion of academics engaged upon research do so (for material gain) under contract ? (This includes academics appointed to execute specific research projects).

Approx. %

Qualifying Remarks :

(iv) State of Management Technology etc.

1. Which of the following employ computerised systems ?

	Fully Computerised	Partly Computerised	No computer usage
Remuneration (pay-roll)			
Staff data			
Student data (including academic performance)			
Equipment data			
Space, inventory and utilization system (e.g. lecture scheduling)			
General planning and resource information system			
Library			

Answer the remaining questions in this section by circling the correct replies.

Does administration explicitly and formally include processes for systematic reviews of administrative posts and their functions ? YES NO

Does administration employ a general training scheme for recruited administrators ? YES NO

Is there any specific scheme employed to encourage mobility between administrative posts ? YES NO

Is there any official (periodic or otherwise) institutional statement of policy, goals, and objectives ? YES NO

Is there any official (periodic or otherwise) statement of the organisation of the university ? YES NO

Is education conducted according to the (American) "unit of credit" or some equivalent system ? YES NO PARTLY

Is there a specialist Information Office or equivalent entity ? YES NO

Is there a specialist Planning unit ? YES NO

Within administration, is there a clear and recognised distinction between tactical planning (short term implementation type planning) and strategic planning (long term policy type planning) ? YES NO

Is planning conducted according to regular cyclical schedules ? YES NO

Is resource allocation geared to a regular budgetary cycle ? YES NO

Are resources allocated with reference to specific logistic formulae and ratios ? * YES NO

* e.g. according to how many students are enrolled on a particular programme, or how many staff there are engaged on it, or some similar formal and numerate method.

Qualifying remarks :

II. The Particular Faculty and Department

Name of Faculty ..... Name of Department .....

(i) Basic Statistics

	Faculty	Department
Total number of academics		
Total number of support staff (secretarial, technical)		
Number of First Degree students		
Number of Higher Degree students		
Number of academics with permanent tenure		
Gross remuneration for academics		
Total annual recurrent expenditure		
Number of academic posts with explicit administrative obligations		

Qualifying remarks :

For the Department only :

Average number of teaching* hours per week per academic staff member	

* Include lecturing and tutorials etc.

Average weekly scheduled student hours received by :

(a) First Degree Students:

Lectures	
Tutorials, seminars etc.	

(b) Higher Degree Students

Lectures	
Tutorials, seminars etc.	

Approximate drop-out rates (= percentage of those who enrol for a Degree who fail to complete course) :

First Degree Students	
Higher Degree Students	

Qualifying remarks :

(ii) Formal Structure

A concise description of the Faculty's and the particular Department's formal structure is required. This should be diagrammatic wherever possible and contain reference to :

(a) The Departmental divisions of the Faculty

(b) The officer structure within the Faculty as a whole and within the particular Department. Indication should be given of offices with special administrative responsibility.

(c) Committee structures involving the Faculty on a whole or the particular department

To illustrate the detail and type of information required, example replies valid for the University of Sussex in England are enclosed. Of course, the format of these replies may not exactly suit the structure of your institution.

Note that the detailed inter-relationships between (a), (b) and (c) are not required: this information should emerge from other parts of the study. Here we are concerned primarily with the patterns of heirarchial and horizontal organisation within the Faculty.

For this section, you are requested to provide your own answer sheets.

(iii) Other Factors

Do the various Faculties within the institution effectively compete for their shares of

	Keen Competition	Some Competition	No Competition
(a) capital expenditure allowance *			
(b) academic posts			
(c) building space			

Do the various Departments within the Faculty effectively compete for their shares of

	Keen Competition	Some Competition	No Competition
(a) capital expenditure allowance *			
(b) academic posts			
(c) office space			

* excludes all remuneration

If allocations between Faculties and Departments of types (a), (b) and (c) have to be made, is such allocation determined by one or a few individuals, a committee, or another specified body ?

Allocation between Faculties of :	Less than 5 individuals	A Committee	Other (Specify)
Capital expenditure allowance			
academic posts			
building space			

Allocation between Departments of	Less than 4 individuals	A Committee	Other (Specify)
Capital expenditure allowance			
Academic Posts			
Office space			

Qualifying remarks :

Does the Faculty have any direct or private sources of finance (i.e. not via central administration) ? Circle answer :

YES NO

Does the Department have any direct or private source(s) of finance (i.e. not via central administration nor via the Faculty) ? Circle answer:

YES NO

Is any Departmental income internally generated (e.g. by student fees or by consultancy fees, etc.) ? And if so, does this make an important contribution to the Departmental budget ?

No internally generated income	Yes, but not important	Yes, important	Yes, very important

Qualifying Remarks :

Are private consultancy and/or private research contracts, significant sources of income for academics within the Department ?

No	Yes, but not important	Yes important	Yes, very important

CONTINGENCY STUDIES

77

INSTRUCTIONS TO INVESTIGATOR

The purpose of the contingency studies is to provide some basis for direct objective comparison between the processes of administration at different institutions of higher education. This is a useful complement to the relatively subjective measures obtainable by standard questionnaire techniques.

To this end, a number of situations which could arise in any institution of higher education and which require administrative response have been identified. Each such situation is termed a "contingency". Questions are then asked of how administration would respond in practice to each of these contingencies. Answers to these questions will provide a basis for direct and objective comparisons between the administrations of different institutions.

Unfortunately, there are many difficulties in formulating contingencies and querying response to them in ways applicable to institutions of higher education throughout Europe. For this reason, the following options are open in answering each contingency:

(i) The contintency does not "fit" your institution. If, by a slight modification, you can alter the contingency to a situation which could arise in your institution, you are encouraged to make such an alteration, indicating the change in a qualifying remark.

(ii) The questions asked about administrative response to the contingency do not "fit" your institution. In this case, then (as an alternative to answering the questions) you may provide a written description of how the contingency would be dealt with in your institution.* This should be a concise account of the sequence of actions, inter-actions, and decisions likely to be initiated by the contingency, and containing particular reference to who or what body of people does what, and to probable time lags involved.

(iii) An additional degree of freedom is provided in that you may select four out of five set contingencies to reply to.

* Please provide your own answer sheets for this.

It is, however, hoped that as many institutions as possible will complete their selected four contingency studies as they are presented.

Notes When a contingency refers to a specific Department or Faculty, it is intended that the Department or Faculty be those indicated in the Information Sheet and investigated in the Departmental sections of this study.

For definitions of other terms employed, please consult the Glossary.

It is in this part of the study that the investigators co-operation and initiative are most essential. It is not intended that these contingency "questionnaires" be immediately answerable: rather, filling in replies to these sheets would be a matter of researched enquiry. Real accuracy is important here, and rough guesses (though better than nothing) are to be minimized.

It is left to the investigators discretion as to how he obtains the information requested. Three recommended methods to be borne in mind are (a) interviews with people involved with such contingencies (b) retracing the development of similar contingencies which occurred in the past (c) infering administrative response from its (known) organisational structures and procedures.

It would certainly help future investigations if each investigator listed his main sources of information after the contingency studies.

Where information is requested about who is responsible for taking certain decisions, the title or function of the officer should be cited, rather than the name of an individual.

CONTINGENCY NO. 1.

A Level 3 academic wishes to modify significantly part of a First Degree course he teaches in order to accommodate new research. This naturally entails adjustments to both lecture and examination content, although the actual title of the course may remain unaltered.

Q.1. Are all such courses described in some detail (more than just the title of the course) in official written syllabi ?

Yes	No

Suppose that at some given point in time, the academic becomes motivated to effect this change.

Qualifying remarks on applicability of this contingency to your institution:

Q.2. Is there a formally defined (written) procedure for this contingency ?

Yes	No

If not, is there an accepted informal (unwritten) procedure for this contingency ?

Yes	No

If either of the above replies were yes, is the academic likely to be fully aware of the correct procedure ?

Yes	Maybe	No

Q.3. Could the academic effect the change without reference to any other person or body for approval ?

Yes	No

If not, would he need the formal approval of

	Yes	No
Head of Department		
An academic peer in the Department		
Some committee representing the Department		
Some authority at level higher than Departmental		
More than one of the above		
Other (specify)		

Is there any student representation in this decision of approval ?

Yes	No

Estimate the total number of academics who could politically influence the granting of approval

Again in the event of approval being required, how long would you expect it to take to gain this approval (in months) ?

At least	
At most	

Q.4. Whatever the situation regarding formal procedures, is there likely to have been any informal consultation of

	Yes	Maybe	No
Other academics in Department			
Head of Department			
Students			

Q.5. (Approval having been obtained if necessary) to how many people, if any, would the lecturer be expected to send directly details of his revisions ? And how many of these would be full-time administrators ?

Total number	
Administrators	

Q.6. Before the changes were finally effected, would any form of administrative go-ahead be required, and if so, would the go-ahead be informal, formal or both ?

	Yes Informal	Yes Formal	Yes Both	No
Admin. Go-ahead needed				

Q.7. Estimate (in months) the total time lapse between the academic's initial motivation and the change in the actual teaching of the modified course.

At least	
At most	

Q.8. Is it likely for this change to have taken place <u>without</u> the knowledge of

	Likely	Unlikely
Some academic in same Department		
Head of Department		
Some academic in same faculty		
<u>Any</u> administrative official		
<u>Any</u> student		

Q.9. In how many committee meetings is the subject of the change likely to have arisen ?

	None	One or Two	Three or Four	More
At least				
At most				

Number of different committees likely to be involved

None	One	Two	More than Two

Q.10. (Optional. Complete only if you feel you can reasonably estimate the quantities concerned).

Estimate roughly the total number of documents which are likely to have been circulated on account of this contingency. Also estimate roughly the total number of two person (not committee) conversations (including telephone calls) in which this contingency is likely to have been mentioned.

	Documents		Conversations	
	At least	At most	At least	At most
Within academics				
Within administration				
Between these sectors.				

Qualifying remarks

CONTINGENCY NO. 2

A department wishes to obtain an expensive ($\sim$ £1,000) piece of equipment which will assist its teaching and research programs (e.g. a large calculating machine). The Department seeks to finance this purchase from external funds.

Qualifying remarks on the applicability of this contingency to your institution:

Q.1. Is there a formally defined (written) procedure for this contingency ?

Yes	No

If not, is there an accepted informal (unwritten) procedure for this contingency

Yes	No

If either of the above replies were yes, how many academics in the Department in question are likely to be aware of the correct procedure ?

Most	Some	Few

Q.2. On account of this contingency, is there any way the Department might obtain money above any allowances it would in any case receive ?

Yes	No

If not, move on to the next question.

If so, would this extra money come from

	Tick appropriate Box(es)
A fixed Faculty allowance	
A Faculty allowance which could possibly be increased on account of this contingency	
General institutional funds	
Other (Please specify)	

Would formal applications for the (extra) money need to be written, and if so who would write them and to whom would they be sent ?

No	

Yes	From	To

Would the final approval or rejection of the application for money depend upon

(i) Written regulations *and* their strict interpretation

Yes	Partly	No

(ii) A formal committee

Yes	Partly	No

If so, please indicate:

Total number in committee	
Number of committee members in Department concerned	
Number of committee members in Faculty concerned, excluding those in the Department	
Number of administrators in committee	

(iii) A relatively informal procedure, the discretion of one or a few people being more important than formulae or votes

Yes	Partly	No

If so, is it likely that all parties concerned would be adequately consulted ?

Yes	Partly	No

Again if so, name the one or few officers upon whose discretion the approval depends:

(iv) Other (specify)

Q.3. Which of the following have influence on the approval or disapproval of the purchase ?

	Significant Influence	Some Influence	No influence at all
Head of Department			
Level 3 academic in Department			
Level 2 academic in Faculty			
Head of Faculty			
External regulations imposed on budget disbursement			
Administrators (Specify who)			
Members of other Faculties			
Students			

Q.4. Estimate the total time (in months) between the Department's first intentions to purchase the equipment and its physical arrival in the Department

At least	At most

Who would be responsible for the physical act of purchasing the equipment ?

Q.5. Is it likely for the whole contingency to have taken place without the knowledge of

	Likely	Unlikely
Some academic in same Department		
Some " " " Faculty		
Any administrative official		

Q.6. In how many committee meetings is the subject of the proposed purchase likely to have arisen ?

	None	One or Two	Three or Four	More
At least				
At most				

Number of different committees likely to be involved

None	One	Two	More than Two

Q.7. (Optional. Complete only if you feel you can reasonably estimate the quantities concerned).

Estimate roughly the total number of documents which are likely to have been circulated on account of this contingency. Also estimate roughly the total number of two person (not committee) conversations (including telephone calls) in which the contingency is likely to have been mentioned.

	Documents		Conversations	
	At least	At Most	At least	At Most
Within academics				
Within administration				
Between these sectors				

CONTINGENCY NO. 3

A change in national consciousness and circumstance (e.g. environmental/ ecological) causes a shift in the pattern of student applications, so that a Department receives a large number of applications. Furthermore, an external source (e.g. the State) indicates interest in and intention of sponsoring research and education in the field of this Department. Nevertheless, there is some feeling within academic circles that this new interest is but a passing fad, and that therefore expansion of the Department in question is to be resisted. The central issue becomes the creation of some permanent posts within the Department which can only be funded by the institution itself, although the external body aforesaid is prepared to donate a substantial initial bequest.

Qualifying remarks on applicability of this contingency to your institution:

Q.1. Is there a formally defined (written) procedure for deciding whether to create these new appointments ?

Yes	No

If not, is there an accepted informal (unwritten) procedure for this contingency ?

Yes	No

If either of the above replies were yes, how many academics in the Faculty in question are likely to be fully aware of the correct procedure ?

Most	Some	Few

There are two possible types of decision to be taken here:

(i) GENERAL POLICY. Is the Department's expansion approved in principle, or to a limited extent, or not at all ?

(ii) SPECIFIC PROPOSAL. Is the appointment of (say) two extra Level 2 academics and one extra Level 3 academic approved or rejected ?

Q.2. Is a decision of type (i) effectively taken before any detailed proposals are developed ?

Yes	No

Are the two types of decision inseparably merged in one process at your institution ?

Yes	No

Q.3. If the general policy decision can be separated from decisions concerning specific proposals, then answer the following questions about the general policy decisions :

Does effective authority for such decision lie with

	Yes	Who ?
A single person		
Five or less people		
A larger group of people		

Indicate the number of people in whom effective authority for such decision lies who are

Within the Department in question	
Within the Faculty in which the Department is located	
Administrators	
Other	

Which of the following people have influence in such decision ?

	Formal * Influence			Informal ** Influence		
Academics in Department in question:	Signi-ficant	Some	None	A lot	Some	None
Level 3						
Level 2						
Level 1						
Academics in Faculty in question:						
Level 3						
Level 2						
Level 1						
Students						
Administrators (specify)						
Other (specify)						

* e.g. voting right on some committee or direct powers

** e.g. opinion may be consulted

Q.4. **Which of the following people could influence the development of any specific proposals (prior to any decision being taken on their implementation) ?**

	Formal * Influence			Informal ** Influence		
Academics in Department in question:	Significant	Some	None	A lot	Some	None
Level 3						
Level 2						
Level 1						
Academics in Faculty in question:						
Level 3						
Level 2						
Level 1						
Students						
Administrators (specify)						
Other (specify)						

* e.g. voting right on some committee or direct powers

** e.g. opinion may be consulted

Q.5. **Which of the following people have influence in deciding whether or not to implement specific proposals ?**

	Formal * Influence			Informal ** Influence		
Academics in Department in question:	Significant	Some	None	A lot	Some	None
Level 3						
Level 2						
Level 1						
Academics in Faculty in question:						
Level 3						
Level 2						
Level 1						
Students						
Administrators (specify)						
Other (specify)						

* e.g. voting right on some committee or direct powers

** e.g. opinion may be consulted

Q.6. Estimate the probable time (in months) between the declaration (of interest and initial financing offer) by the external body and the actual employment of new staff.

[ ]

Q.7. Is it likely for this whole contingency to be resolved without the knowledge of

	Likely	Unlikely
Some academic in the Faculty concerned		
Any student		

Q.8. It is probable that some temporary committee would be created to deal specifically with this contingency ?

Yes	No

Apart from the meetings of such a committee, in about how many committee meetings is this contingency likely to have been discussed ?

[ ]

Total number of different committees likely to be involved in resolving contingency

[ ]

Q.9. Working out specific proposals for expansion would presumably entail high order ratification from administration (e.g.accountants)

How many administrative officials would be directly concerned with the ratification of such proposals ?

[ ]

Would most of these administrators be actively consulted/informed throughout the progress of this contingency ?

Yes	No

Qualifying Remarks:

CONTINTENCY NO. 4

A Level 2 academic (who is responsible for some teaching) gives notice that he will be quitting his post at the institution.

Q.1. What is the minimum length of time (in weeks) that must elapse before the lecturer is free to legally leave his job at the institution ?

Consequently a replacement (from outside) is sought. To this end there will follow a sequence of decisions and actions leading finally to the appointment of a successor. Precisely, we divide this sequence into three successive stages:

Stage 1. - Vacancy advertised, applications received

Q.2. Who is responsible for writing the appropriate advertisements ?

Head of Department		
Head of Faculty		
Another academic (specify)		
Administration	With academic co-operation	
	Without any academic co-operation	

Who is responsible for choosing which journals/papers the vacancy is advertised in ?

Head of Department	
Head of Faculty	
Another academic (specify)	
Administration	
Choice automatic	

Where does responsibility lie for the physical insertion of the advertisements ?

In the Department	
In the Faculty	
In administration	

Q.3. To whom would each applicant be asked to send his application, curriculae vitae, and name of referees ?

Would referees be automatically consulted at this point, or would there first be some preliminary selection ?

Yes	No

Is there a standard application form to be completed (again prior to any selection) ?

Yes	No

Estimate the time lapse (in weeks) during Stage 1.

Q.4. At whatever stage it occurred, who would be responsible for requesting references from named referees ?

Stage II - Selection Procedure

A large number of applications are received, making some selection on the basis of written applications alone necessary. In other words, a short-list of applicants is to be drawn up.

Q.5. List all people to whom copies of written applications would be circulated as a matter of course :

Do all academics in the Department in question have the right to see these applications if they wish to ?

Yes	No

Do Level 2 academics in the Faculty in question have the right to see these applications if they wish to ?

Yes	No

Q.6. Tick the appropriate boxes in the following diagram illustrating the degrees of influence of various personnel in the (preliminary) selection of a short-list :

	Formal * Influence			Informal ** Influence	
	Total	Some	None	Some	None
Head of Department					
Head of Faculty					
Level 2 academic in Dept					
Level 3 academic in Dept					
Level 2 academic in Faculty					
Administrators (specify)					
Other (specify)					

* e.g. voting right on a selection committee, or right of veto, or direct powers, etc.

** e.g. opinion likely to be consulted or carry weight

Having selected the short list, the people on it are invited for interview so that a final selection can be made

Q.7. Estimate (in weeks) the time lapse between the closing date for applications and the date for the (last) interviews.

Q.8. Does each applicant have only one interview and no other ab[illegible]ty test ?

Yes	No

List all people present at the main and official interview of each candidate :

How long, roughly, does each interview last ?

Q.9. Tick the appropriate boxes in the following diagram illustrating the degree of influence of various personnel on the final selection of a particular candidate for the vacancy :

	Formal Influence			Informal Influence	
	Total	Some	None	Some	None
Head of Department					
Head of Faculty					
Level 2 academic in Dept					
Level 3 " " "					
Other academic officers (specify)					
Administrators (specify).					

Qualifying remarks :

Stage 111 - Appointment offered/confirmed

Q.10. Assuming a particular applicant is agreed upon as best, can he be offered the job on the day of his interview either

(a) Outright

Yes	No

(b) Informally, subject to official confirmation

Yes	No

or (c) Not on that day at all ?

Does the selected candidate have to pass a medical examination prior to employment ?

Yes	No

Is there an official letter sent to the applicant offering him the job ?

Yes	No

If so, by what officer is this letter signed ?

Does the successful applicant have to complete and sign a contractual statement regarding his employment ?

Yes	No

If so, does this contract contain reference to teaching or research obligations (in terms of quantitative or qualitative effort and output) ?

Yes	No

Q.11. Estimate the likely time lapse (in weeks) between the notice given by the departing academic and the first day of work by his replacement.

Q.12 In how many committee meetings is the subject of this appointment likely to have arisen ?

	None	One or Two	Three or Four	More
At least				
At most				

Number of different committees likely to be involved:

None	One	Two	More

Q.13 (Optional. Complete only if you feel you can reasonably estimate the quantities concerned).

Estimate roughly the total number of documents which are likely to have been (internally)circulated on account of this contingency.

	At least	At most
Within academics		
Within administration		
Between these sectors		

Qualifying remarks:

CONTINGENCY NO. 5

During the course of an important (First Degree) examination, an invigilating examiner notices that one of the students is cheating.

Qualifying remarks on applicability of this contingency to your institution:

Q.1 Is there a formally defined (written) procedure for such a contingency ?

Yes	No

If not, is there an accepted informal (unwritten) procedure for such a contingency ?

Yes	No

If either of the above replies were yes, is the examiner likely to be fully aware of the correct procedure ?

Yes	No

Q.2 Before the student can be punished, is there some process by which the student is "convicted" as guilty of cheating ?

	Yes	No
A formal defined process of conviction		
An accepted informal process of conviction		
Conviction of a kind necessary, but actual process can vary with circumstances		
The word of the invigilator is taken as true without further investigation		

If there is, effectively, a process of "conviction" prior to punishment, what official or group of people have the right of such conviction ?

In the process of conviction, would the student concerned be allowed to give any evidence or have any right of appeal ?

Yes	No

If he can appeal, to what official or group of people can he make ultimate appeal ?

Which of the following people have influence in such conviction ?

	Formal * Influence			Informal ** Influence	
Academics in Faculty in question	Signi-ficant	Some	None	Some	None
Level 3					
Level 2					
Level 1					
Head of Faculty					
Official(s) outside Faculty in question					
Students					
Other (specify)					

* e.g. voting right on some committee, or direct powers etc.

** e.g. opinion may be consulted or carry weight

Q.3 Assuming the student in question was judged guilty of cheating, some punishment would presumably follow.

Could the punishment vary at all according to the circumstances of the particular instance ?

Yes	No

Is the student automatically disqualified from obtaining

	Yes	No
(a) any credit from that examination		
(b) his Degree from the institution		

Is punishment at the discretion of some official or group of people ?

Yes	No

If so, which of the following people have influence in deciding upon the punishment ?

Academics in Faculty	Formal Influence			Informal Influence	
	Significant	Some	None	Some	None
Level 3					
Level 2					
Level 1					
Head of Faculty					
Official(s) outside Faculty in question					
Students					
Other (specify)					

Q.4. Assuming the student confesses his cheating, estimate the time lapse (in days) between the examination and exact knowledge of his punishment. [ ]

Q.5. In how many committee meetings is the subject of this contingency likely to have arisen ?

	None	One or Two	Three or Four	More
At least				
At most				

Number of different committees likely to be involved ?

None	One	Two	More

Q.6. (Optional. Complete only if you feel you can reasonably estimate the quantities concerned).

Estimate roughly the total number of documents which are likely to have been circulated on account of this contingency. Also estimate roughly the total number of two person (not committee) conversations (including telephone calls) in which this contingency is likely to have been mentioned.

	Documents		Conversations	
	At least	At most	At least	At most
Within academics				
Within administration				
Between these sectors				

Qualifying remarks:

Information sources found useful in completing Contingency Studies, and general comments on the methodology :

GLOSSARY

ORGANISATIONAL UNITS

Areas. The total institution is broadly divided into areas (of activity) e.g. arts, social science, medicine, academic support services, central administration, etc. Of course, these illustrative divisions into areas may not correspond exactly to the operative divisions in your institution.

Faculties. Many of the above areas constitute a major educational bloc within the institution, in which case they are termed Faculties e.g. Faculty of Arts, Faculty of Social Science, Faculty of Medicine, etc.

Departments. Each Faculty is divided into relatively specialist subject groups called Departments e.g. within the Faculty of Pure Science there might be a Department of Physics, a Department of Chemistry, etc.

Committees and User Groups. These are groups of people who meet with some common purpose and have the ability to act collectively e.g. Social Science Committee, Honorary Degree Committee, Computer Users Group, the Student Union, etc.

CATEGORIES OF PERSONNEL

Students are any people studying full-time to obtain some Degree or other qualification from the institution. They are divided into :
First Degree students : students studying for a First Degree.
Higher Degree students ;students studying for a Higher Degree.
(For definitions of First and Higher Degrees, see the glossary on educational terms)

Academic staff refers to all teaching and research personnel for all grades including Assistants. A particular member of the academic staff is called an academic. The term 'Faculty' will always apply to the organisational unit defined above, and never to any personnel. In this study, academic staff are divided into three levels :
Level 1. This level corresponds to top-order academic staff, including Heads of Departments, permanent Professors, etc.
Level 2. This corresponds to middle-order academic staff, the 'typical' academics.
Level 3. This corresponds to lower-order academic staff, including the youngest and often temporary appointees or assistants, etc.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Any division of academics along these general lines is permissible. The following table suggests such divisions for certain countries :

Country	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
BELGIUM	1. Professeurs Ordinaires A 2. Professeurs Extraordinaires A 3. Professeurs Associés A 4. Professeurs A à l'Institut	1. Chefs de Travaux A 2. Chefs de Travaux Associés A 3. Chargés de cours Associés A 4. Chefs de Travaux à titre Personnel	1. Lecture A 2. Assistants A 3. Assistants A. Hors cadre
NETHERLANDS	Hoogleraren	1. Lectoren 2. Buitengewoon hoogleraren 3. Buitengewoon lectoren 4. Onderwijsopdrachten 5. Wetenschappelijke hoofdmedewerkers 6. Wetenschappelijke hoofdambtenaren	1. Wetenschappelijke ambtenaren 2. Wetenschappelijke medewerkers 3. Wetenschappelijke Assistenten 4. Studentenassistenten
NORWAY	1. Professor	1. Docent 2. Prospectors 3. Amanuenses 4. Konservator 5. Laboratoriesingenieur 6. Universitetslektor	1. Universitetsstipendiat 2. Vitenskapeligassistent
SWITZERLAND	1. Professeurs Ordinaires 2. Professeurs Extraord. 3. Professeurs Invités	1. Professeurs Suppléants 2. Professeurs assistants 3. Prof. assoc., ch. cours 4. Chargés rech./chef travaux	5. Assistants
YUGOSLAVIA	1. Permanent Professor 3. Professor	1. Docent 2. Scientific Counsellor 3. Senior lecturer 4. Lector 5. Scientific Collaborator 6. Lecturer	1. Coach 2. Assistant Professor

This table is reproduced from "Subject Field and Regional Variations in Student/Staff ratios, Academic Programmes and Recurrent Expenditure", a technical report by B.Fredriksen published by C.E.R.I. in the I.M.H.E. series.

Administrative staff refers to all staff appointed specifically to assist the administrative functions of the institution, both the central administration and that of Faculties and Departments : but excluding clerical and secretarial assistants.

Technicians are staff engaged to keep the institution maintained and running physically e.g. electricians, laboratory assistants etc.

Officers are official heads of groups of people e.g. Head Librarian, President of Student Union, Heads of Faculties and Departments, etc.

An employee of the institution is anybody on the institution's pay-roll. This therefore includes all the categories of personnel excepting students.

EDUCATIONAL INSTRUCTION

A Degree is any recognised award, Diploma, qualification which the Institution grants to students e.g. Bachelor's Degree, Master's Degree, Doctorate, etc.

A programme of study is a group of study subjects taken over a period of a year or more in order to obtain one of the institution's Degrees.

A course is the most disaggregated element of academic teaching activities and is usually one term or one semester's instruction in a particular topic.

FINANCIAL TERMS

Annual recurrent expenditure excludes all non-recurrent capital expenditure such as expenditure for construction and equipment, but includes minor capital expenditure and all recurrent costs such as remuneration of employees.

Gross remuneration includes all payments made to an employee, before tax deductions and including employer's contribution to social security, pension schemes etc. "Gross remuneration" should include all payments irrespective of the source of funds. For example, payments to an employee may in part or full come from the Ministry's budget.